

Remarks

The Examiner argued that the amendment filed on November 26, 2008 was non-compliant, because it inadvertently included an argument concerning a cancelled claim 30.

It is clear from the record that claim 30 was cancelled (see, page 9, line 9 of the November 26, 2008 amendment). Accordingly, the rejection concerning claim 30 thus has naturally been rendered moot.

The Examiner required that the Applicants must delete the argument concerning claim 30.

Applicants herewith request that the argument concerning claim 30 at page 14 of the November 26 Amendment be fully redacted and replaced with the following argument:

The Examiner rejected claim 30 alleging that “it is unclear that the terminus is the terminus of what.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the definiteness requirement has been rendered moot in view of cancellation of claim 30.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

The Applicants believe no fees are due at this time. However, in the event that any additional fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Nixon Peabody LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0850.

Date: July 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 50607

/Leena H. Karttunen/

Ronald I. Eisenstein (Reg. No. 30,628)

Leena H. Karttunen (Reg. No. 60,335)

Nixon Peabody LLP

(617) 345-6054 / 1367